

ON EXISTENCE OF CANONICAL  $G$ -BASESDANIEL HOFFMANN<sup>†</sup>

ABSTRACT. We describe a general method for expanding a truncated  $G$ -iterative Hasse-Schmidt derivation, where  $G$  is an algebraic group. We give examples of algebraic groups for which our method works.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Basic notions about $F$ -derivations	2
2.1. HS-derivations	2
2.2. Iterative HS-derivations	4
2.3. Commutative HS-derivations	7
3. Canonical $G$ -bases and the Integrability	9
4. New examples of groups with canonical $G$ -bases	12
4.1. Unipotent groups of dimension two	12
4.2. Canonical $G$ -bases for commutative and connected groups	19
References	21

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Our motivation for this paper is [11] and [3], where some nice model-theoretic properties are obtained for fields equipped with HS-derivations satisfying the standard iterativity rule. After analysis of both reasonings (in [11] and [3]), we deduce that one of the most important properties of an iterative Hasse-Schmidt derivation is Matsumura's *strong integrability* (a notion from [4], see: Definition 2.15). Thus we are especially interested in it.

Briefly, the strong integrability means that a truncated iterative HS-derivation can be expanded to a not-truncated one, satisfying the same iterativity conditions. We prove (Theorem 3.8) that the existence of *canonical basis* (Definition 3.6) implies strong integrability for an arbitrary iterativity condition. However, the converse is not true in general (see Remark 3.9), which is related to the problem of the existence of canonical basis in a given field.

Finding a canonical basis is not an easy task. Hideyuki Matsumura in [4] proved existence of canonical basis for  $\mathbb{G}_a$  (the standard iterativity). Afterwards Andrzej Tyc in [8] did the same for  $\mathbb{G}_m$  and one dimensional formal groups over algebraically closed fields. Martin Ziegler showed existence of canonical bases for powers of  $\mathbb{G}_a$

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 13N15; Secondary 14L15, 20G15.

*Key words and phrases*. Hasse-Schmidt derivations, separably closed fields, algebraic groups, group scheme actions.

proving the quantifier elimination for the theory of separably closed fields in [11] and [10] (see Example 3.7). Before this paper only products of  $\mathbb{G}_a$  and  $\mathbb{G}_m$  were considered. We cover the case of commutative, connected, unipotent groups of dimension 2 over an algebraically closed field. That leads us to Theorem 4.17, stating that, over an algebraically closed field, linear algebraic groups that are connected and commutative have canonical basis if unipotent elements form a subgroup of dimension  $\leq 2$ . This theorem includes all the previous results (mentioned above). Piotr Kowalski and I in [1] are treating iterative HS-derivations in much more abstract way. Many proofs from [1] would be obvious if canonical basis exist for the HS-derivations considered there (a similar sentence was noted at the end of Section 2. in [3]). Moreover, Section 6. in [1] suggests possible generalisations for the notion of canonical basis.

## 2. BASIC NOTIONS ABOUT $F$ -DERIVATIONS

**2.1. HS-derivations.** All the rings considered in this paper are commutative and with unity. Fix a field  $k$  of the characteristic  $p > 0$ ,  $e \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$  and  $m \in \mathbb{N}_{>0} \cup \{\infty\}$ . Let  $R$  be any  $k$ -algebra. In this subsection we recall some definitions and well-known facts about HS-derivations.

**Definition 2.1.** We say that  $\mathbb{D} = (D_{\mathbf{i}} : R \rightarrow R)_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{N}^e}$  is an  $e$ -dimensional HS-derivation over  $k$  if the map

$$\mathbb{D} : R \rightarrow R[\bar{X}], \quad r \mapsto \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{N}^e} D_{\mathbf{i}}(r) \bar{X}^{\mathbf{i}},$$

where  $\bar{X}^{\mathbf{i}} = X_1^{i_1} \cdots X_e^{i_e}$  for  $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_e)$ , is a  $k$ -algebra homomorphism and  $D_0 = \text{id}_R$ .

We introduce  $R[\bar{v}] := R[\bar{X}]/(X_1^{p^m}, \dots, X_e^{p^m})$ , so  $v_i = X_i + (X_1^{p^m}, \dots, X_e^{p^m})$  and  $\bar{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_e)$  (for  $m = \infty$  we set  $v_i = X_i$ ,  $R[\bar{v}] = R[\bar{X}]$ ). After composing  $\mathbb{D}$  with the natural mapping  $R[\bar{X}] \rightarrow R[\bar{v}]$  we obtain a truncation of  $\mathbb{D}$ , denoted by  $\mathbb{D}[m] = (D_{\mathbf{i}} : R \rightarrow R)_{\mathbf{i} \in [p^m]^e}$ . This lead us to the following:

**Definition 2.2.** A collection  $\mathbb{D} = (D_{\mathbf{i}} : R \rightarrow R)_{\mathbf{i} \in [p^m]^e}$  is called an  $m$ -truncated  $e$ -dimensional HS-derivation over  $k$  if the map

$$\mathbb{D} : R \rightarrow R[\bar{v}], \quad r \mapsto \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in [p^m]^e} D_{\mathbf{i}}(r) \bar{v}^{\mathbf{i}},$$

where  $\bar{v}^{\mathbf{i}} = v_1^{i_1} \cdots v_e^{i_e}$  for  $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_e)$ , is a  $k$ -algebra homomorphism and  $D_0 = \text{id}_R$ .

Clearly, any  $\infty$ -truncated HS-derivation is just an HS-derivation. We have seen that it is easy to obtain from an HS-derivation an  $m$ -truncated one. For a field  $R = K$  the converse is also true.

**Theorem 2.3.** Let  $R$  be a smooth  $k$ -algebra,  $\mathbb{D} = (D_{\mathbf{i}} : R \rightarrow R)_{\mathbf{i} \in [p^m]^e}$  an  $m$ -truncated  $e$ -dimensional HS-derivation over  $k$ . There exists an  $e$ -dimensional HS-derivation  $\mathbb{D}' = (D'_{\mathbf{i}} : R \rightarrow R)_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{N}^e}$  over  $k$  such that for every  $\mathbf{i} \in [p^m]^e$  we have  $D'_{\mathbf{i}} = D_{\mathbf{i}}$ .

*Proof.* The main idea of this proof comes from [4, p. 236]. The algebra  $R$  is smooth over  $k$ , i.e. for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ , any  $k$ -algebra  $C$ , any  $N \trianglelefteq C$  such that  $N^n = 0$  and every  $k$ -algebra homomorphism  $\varphi : R \rightarrow C/N$  there is a lifting of  $\varphi$  to  $\psi : R \rightarrow C$ .

We recursively construct  $\mathbb{D}'$ . Assume that we already have  $D_{\mathbf{i}}$  for every  $\mathbf{i} \in [p^n]^e$ , we show the existence of  $D_{\mathbf{i}}$  for the rest of  $\mathbf{i} \in [p^{n+1}]^e$ . Consider the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} R & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & R[\overline{X}]/(X_1^{p^n}, \dots, X_e^{p^n}) \\ \uparrow & \searrow & \uparrow \pi \\ k & \xrightarrow{\quad} & R[\overline{X}]/(X_1^{p^{n+1}}, \dots, X_e^{p^{n+1}}) \end{array}$$

where  $\varphi(x) := \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in [p^n]^e} D_{\mathbf{i}}(x) \bar{X}^{\mathbf{i}} + (X_1^{p^n}, \dots, X_e^{p^n})$  and  $\pi$  is the quotient map. Since  $(X_1^{p^n}, \dots, X_e^{p^n})^{e(p-1)+1} \subseteq (X_1^{p^{n+1}}, \dots, X_e^{p^{n+1}})$ , all the assumptions of the definition of smoothness are satisfied. Therefore there exists a lifting of  $\varphi$ .  $\square$

**Remark 2.4.** Theorem 2.3 is a generalisation of [4, Thm. 6.]. Note that the best possible situation is for a  $k$ -algebra  $R$  which is étale over  $k$ . In such a case there exists a unique expansion of every  $m$ -truncated  $e$ -dimensional HS-derivation.

By [5, Thm. 26.9], separability implies smoothness, so Theorem 2.3 works in particular for a separable fields extension  $k \subseteq K$ . Because so far we do not demand anything from  $k$  we can take  $k = \mathbb{F}_p$ , hence the assumption about a separable extension  $k \subseteq K$  is negligible in the following way:

**Corollary 2.5.** *Every  $m$ -truncated  $e$ -dimensional HS-derivation on a field  $K$  has an extension to an  $e$ -dimensional HS-derivation.*

We call an  $m$ -truncated  $e$ -dimensional HS-derivation  $\mathbb{D}$  on  $R$  *integrable* if there exists  $e$ -dimensional HS-derivation  $\mathbb{D}'$  on  $R$  such that  $D'_{\mathbf{i}} = D_{\mathbf{i}}$  for every  $\mathbf{i} \in [p^m]^e$ . Corollary 2.5 says that truncated HS-derivations on a field are always integrable, but it is not true for arbitrary rings [4, Example 3.]. Moreover, the described situation dramatically changes after adding some iterativity conditions. Before considering iterative HS-derivations, we state more well-known facts about general HS-derivations, which will be needed in the sequel.

**Lemma 2.6.** *Assume that  $R \xrightarrow{f} S$  is a homomorphism of  $k$ -algebras. Let  $\mathbb{D}$  be an  $m$ -truncated  $e$ -dimensional HS-derivation on  $R$  over  $k$ .*

- i) *If  $S$  is smooth over  $R$ , then there exists an  $m$ -truncated  $e$ -dimensional HS-derivation  $\mathbb{D}'$  on  $S$  over  $k$  such that for every  $i_1, \dots, i_e < p^m$*
- $$(1) \quad f D_{(i_1, \dots, i_e)} = D'_{(i_1, \dots, i_e)} f.$$
- ii) *If  $S$  is unramified over  $R$ , then there exists at most one  $m$ -truncated  $e$ -dimensional HS-derivation  $\mathbb{D}'$  on  $S$  over  $k$  such that for every  $i_1, \dots, i_e < p^m$*
- $$f D_{(i_1, \dots, i_e)} = D'_{(i_1, \dots, i_e)} f.$$

*Proof.* The lemma just reformulates [1, Prop. 3.3].  $\square$

**Fact 2.7.** *For every  $m$ -truncated  $e$ -dimensional HS-derivation and every  $x \in R$  the following holds*

$$D_{(i_1, \dots, i_e)}(x^p) = \begin{cases} D_{(\frac{i_1}{p}, \dots, \frac{i_e}{p})}(x)^p & \text{if } p | i_1, \dots, i_e \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* It is a common and easy fact.  $\square$

**2.2. Iterative HS-derivations.** In this subsection we deal with iterative HS-derivations. The main purpose is to provide basic properties. Let  $F(\bar{v}, \bar{w}) = (F_1(\bar{v}, \bar{w}), \dots, F_e(\bar{v}, \bar{w})) \in (k[\bar{v}, \bar{w}])^e$  (still  $k[\bar{v}, \bar{w}] = k[[\bar{X}, \bar{Y}]]$  for  $m = \infty$ ) and let  $\mathbb{D}$  be an  $m$ -truncated  $e$ -dimensional HS-derivation on  $R$  over  $k$ . Sometimes we need to distinguish between  $\mathbb{D} : R \rightarrow R[\bar{v}]$  and  $\mathbb{D} : R \rightarrow R[\bar{w}]$ , therefore they will be denoted by  $\mathbb{D}_{\bar{v}}$  and  $\mathbb{D}_{\bar{w}}$  respectively.

**Definition 2.8.** We call  $\mathbb{D}$  *F-iterative* if the following diagram commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccc} R & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{D}_{\bar{v}}} & R[\bar{v}] \\ \mathbb{D}_{\bar{v}} \downarrow & & \downarrow \mathbb{D}_{\bar{w}}[\bar{v}] \\ R[\bar{v}] & \xrightarrow{\text{ev}_F} & R[\bar{v}, \bar{w}] \end{array}$$

where  $\mathbb{D}_{\bar{w}}[\bar{v}](\sum_{\mathbf{i}} r_{\mathbf{i}} \bar{v}^{\mathbf{i}}) := \sum_{\mathbf{i}} \mathbb{D}_{\bar{w}}(r_{\mathbf{i}}) \bar{v}^{\mathbf{i}}$ . We will write shortly *F-derivation* for an *F-iterative*  $m$ -truncated  $e$ -dimensional HS-derivation over  $k$ .

**Example 2.9.** For  $m = \infty$  and  $e = 1$  we can take  $F = \mathbb{G}_a = X + Y$ . It encodes the classical iterativity rule

$$D_i \circ D_j = \binom{i+j}{i} D_{i+j}.$$

An example of a  $\mathbb{G}_a$ -derivation is the following collection of functions on  $k[X]$ :

$$D_n\left(\sum_{i=0}^k \alpha_i X^i\right) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{gdy } n > k \\ \sum_{i=n}^k \alpha_i \binom{i}{n} X^{i-n}, & \text{gdy } n \leq k, \end{cases}$$

where  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . For the formal group law  $F = \mathbb{G}_m = X + Y + XY$  above formulas are more complicated (see [2, Example 3.6]).

**Example 2.10.** For every formal group law  $F(\bar{X}, \bar{Y}) \in (k[[\bar{X}, \bar{Y}]])^e$  we have *canonical F-derivation*

$$\mathbb{D}^F := \text{ev}_{F(\bar{X}, \bar{Y})} : k[[\bar{X}]] \rightarrow k[[\bar{X}]][[\bar{Y}]].$$

Compare with [1, Example 3.25].

**Example 2.11.** Let  $\mathfrak{g} = \text{Spec } k[\bar{v}]$  be a group scheme over  $k$  acting by a group scheme action on  $\text{Spec } R$ . That group scheme action corresponds to an *F-derivation* on  $R$ , where  $F$  is the Hopf algebra comultiplication given by  $\mathfrak{g}$ , see [1, Remark 3.9].

Assume that  $R$  is a  $k$ -algebra with an *F-derivation*  $\mathbb{D}$ . The pair  $(R, \mathbb{D})$  will be called *F-ring*. If  $K$  is a field and  $(K, \mathbb{D})$  is an *F-ring*, then  $(K, \mathbb{D})$  will be called *F-field*. Let  $(R, \mathbb{D})$  be an *F-ring*, similarly  $(S, \mathbb{D}')$ . A morphism of  $k$ -algebras  $f : R \rightarrow S$  is *F-morphism* if for every  $\mathbf{i}$ ,  $f D_{\mathbf{i}} = D'_{\mathbf{i}} f$ . Moreover, if such  $f$  is injective,  $R$  is *F-subring* of  $S$  (similarly *F-subfield* for *F-fields*).

**Example 2.12.** Let  $G$  be an algebraic group over  $k$ , we denote by  $\mathcal{O}_G$  the local ring of  $G$  at the identity (it is a regular local ring) and by  $\bar{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_e)$  a choice of its local parameters. For  $F = \hat{G}$  we have  $F(\bar{x}, \bar{Y}) \in \mathcal{O}_G[[\bar{Y}]]$ , so  $(\mathcal{O}_G, \mathbb{D}^F|_{\mathcal{O}_G})$  is an *F-subring* of  $(k[[\bar{X}]], \mathbb{D}^F)$ . Hence  $k(G)$  is equipped with a natural  $\hat{G}$ -derivation, which will be denoted by  $\mathbb{D}^G$  and called *canonical G-derivation*. It depends on

the choice of local parameters, but we prefer the adjective “canonical”. For more details check [1, Example 3.27].

For an  $F$ -ring  $(R, \mathbb{D})$  and  $\mathbf{i} \in [p^m]^e$  we introduce  $C_{\mathbf{i}} := \ker D_{\mathbf{i}}$ , and two more sets:

$$C_R := C_{(1,0,\dots,0)} \cap \dots \cap C_{(0,\dots,0,1)} \quad (\text{the ring of constants}),$$

and

$$C_R^{\text{ab}} := \bigcap_{\mathbf{i} \neq \mathbf{0}} C_{\mathbf{i}} \quad (\text{the ring of absolute constants}).$$

Both,  $C_R$  and  $C_R^{\text{ab}}$ , are subrings of  $R$  (see Remark 3.1).

**Lemma 2.13.** *Assume that  $R \xrightarrow{f} S$  is a homomorphism of  $k$ -algebras. Let  $\mathbb{D}$  be an  $F$ -derivation on  $R$ .*

- i) *If  $S$  is étale (smooth and unramified) over  $R$ , then there exists a unique  $F$ -derivation  $\mathbb{D}'$  on  $S$  such that for every  $i_1, \dots, i_e < p^m$*

$$fD_{(i_1, \dots, i_e)} = D'_{(i_1, \dots, i_e)}f.$$

- ii) *If  $S$  is unramified over  $R$ , then there exists at most one  $F$ -derivation  $\mathbb{D}'$  on  $S$  such that for every  $i_1, \dots, i_e < p^m$*

$$fD_{(i_1, \dots, i_e)} = D'_{(i_1, \dots, i_e)}f.$$

*Proof.* Compare to [1, Prop. 3.18]. Part ii) is obvious by Lemma 2.6.ii). For the proof of part i), it is enough to show that an HS-derivation  $\mathbb{D}'$  from Lemma 2.6 is  $F$ -iterative, i.e. the following diagram is commutative

$$\begin{array}{ccc} S & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{D}'_v} & S[\bar{v}] \\ \mathbb{D}'_{\bar{v}} \downarrow & & \downarrow \mathbb{D}'_{\bar{w}}[\bar{v}] \\ S[\bar{v}] & \xrightarrow{\text{ev}_F} & S[\bar{v}, \bar{w}] \end{array}$$

It is similar to the proof of [5, Theorem 27.2] and we leave it to the reader.  $\square$

Let  $F(\bar{v}, \bar{w}) \in (k[\bar{v}, \bar{w}])^e$ ,  $m' \leq m$  and let  $\bar{v}', \bar{w}'$  denote the  $m'$ -truncated variables  $(k[\bar{v}', \bar{w}'] = k[\bar{X}, \bar{Y}]/(X_1^{p^{m'}}, \dots, X_e^{p^{m'}}, Y_1^{p^{m'}}, \dots, Y_e^{p^{m'}}))$ . By  $F[m']$  we denote the  $m'$ -truncation of  $F$  which is equal to  $\text{ev}_{(\bar{v}', \bar{w}')} F(\bar{v}, \bar{w})$  (the image of  $F$  in the ring of truncated polynomials  $(k[\bar{v}', \bar{w}'])^e$ ). If  $\mathbb{D}$  is  $F$ -iterative, then  $\mathbb{D}[m']$  is  $F[m']$ -iterative as well (for the notion of  $\mathbb{D}[m]$ , check the first lines after Definition 2.1).

**Example 2.14.** For every  $m \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$  we get a  $\hat{G}[m]$ -field structure on  $k(G)$  - just consider  $\mathbb{D}^G[m]$ .

**Definition 2.15.** Let  $F(\bar{X}, \bar{Y}) \in (k[\bar{X}, \bar{Y}])^e$  and let  $\mathbb{D}$  be an  $F[m]$ -derivation on a  $k$ -algebra  $R$ . We call  $\mathbb{D}$  *strongly integrable* if there exists an  $F$ -derivation  $\mathbb{D}'$  on  $R$  such that  $\mathbb{D}'[m] = \mathbb{D}$ .

In the next few facts we give simple properties of  $F$ -derivations on a  $k$ -algebra  $R$ . Those facts were intended for a formal group law  $F$ , but it is enough to demand that  $F(\bar{v}, \bar{w}) \in (k[\bar{v}, \bar{w}])^e$ ,  $F(\bar{v}, \bar{0}) = \bar{v}$  and  $F(\bar{0}, \bar{w}) = \bar{w}$ .

**Fact 2.16.** *For every  $\mathbf{i}$  and  $\mathbf{j}$  there exists  $\mathcal{O}(D_{\mathbf{j}'})_{0 < |\mathbf{j}'| < |\mathbf{i} + \mathbf{j}|}$ , a  $k$ -linear combination of  $D_{\mathbf{j}'}$ , where  $0 < |\mathbf{j}'| < |\mathbf{i} + \mathbf{j}|$ , such that*

$$D_{\mathbf{j}} D_{\mathbf{i}} = \binom{i_1 + j_1}{i_1} \cdots \binom{i_e + j_e}{i_e} D_{\mathbf{i} + \mathbf{j}} + \mathcal{O}(D_{\mathbf{j}'})_{0 < |\mathbf{j}'| < |\mathbf{i} + \mathbf{j}|}.$$

*Proof.* It is clear for  $\mathbf{i} = \mathbf{0}$  or  $\mathbf{j} = \mathbf{0}$ , so assume that both  $\mathbf{i}$  and  $\mathbf{j}$  differ from  $\mathbf{0}$ . Since  $F(\bar{v}, 0) = \bar{v}$ ,  $F(0, \bar{w}) = \bar{w}$ , we have  $F(\bar{v}, \bar{w}) = (v_1 + w_1 + S_1, \dots, v_e + w_e + S_e)$  for some  $S_1, \dots, S_e$  belonging to the ideal  $(v_i w_j)_{i,j \leq e}$ . Therefore for every  $r \in R$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum D_{(j_1, \dots, j_e)} D_{(i_1, \dots, i_e)}(r) v_1^{i_1} \cdots v_e^{i_e} \cdot w_1^{j_1} \cdots w_e^{j_e} = \\ \sum D_{(k_1, \dots, k_e)}(r) (v_1 + w_1 + S_1)^{k_1} \cdots (v_e + w_e + S_e)^{k_e}. \end{aligned}$$

We are interested in the coefficients at  $v_1^{i_1} \cdots v_e^{i_e} \cdot w_1^{j_1} \cdots w_e^{j_e}$  on the right side of the above equation. After comparing degrees, we state that there is no chance for  $k_1 + \dots + k_e > |\mathbf{i} + \mathbf{j}|$ . Let  $k_1 + \dots + k_e = |\mathbf{i} + \mathbf{j}|$ . Because of  $S_1, \dots, S_e \in (v_i w_j)_{i,j \leq e}$ , the only possibility “omits”  $S_1, \dots, S_e$ .  $\square$

**Fact 2.17.** *Assume that also  $\mathbb{D}'$  is an  $F$ -derivation on  $R$ . If for all  $l \leq e$  and  $i < m$  we have  $D_{(0, \dots, 0, \underset{l\text{-th place}}{p^i}, 0, \dots, 0)} = D'_{(0, \dots, 0, \underset{l\text{-th place}}{p^i}, 0, \dots, 0)}$  then  $\mathbb{D} = \mathbb{D}'$ .*

*Proof.* Induction on  $|\mathbf{j}|$ . Take  $\mathbf{j}$  and assume that  $D_{\mathbf{j}'} = D'_{\mathbf{j}'}$  for every  $\mathbf{j}'$  such that  $|\mathbf{j}'| < |\mathbf{j}|$ . Without loss of generality set  $j_1 > 0$ . Let  $j_1 = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 p + \dots + \gamma_s p^s$ , where  $\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_s < p$  and  $\gamma_s \neq 0$ . Fact 2.16 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} D_{(p^s, 0, \dots, 0)} D_{(j_1 - p^s, j_2, \dots, j_e)} &= \gamma_s D_{\mathbf{j}} + \mathcal{O}(D_{\mathbf{j}'})_{0 < |\mathbf{j}'| < |\mathbf{j}|}, \\ D'_{(p^s, 0, \dots, 0)} D'_{(j_1 - p^s, j_2, \dots, j_e)} &= \gamma_s D'_{\mathbf{j}} + \mathcal{O}(D'_{\mathbf{j}'})_{0 < |\mathbf{j}'| < |\mathbf{j}|}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from the inductive assumption that  $D_{\mathbf{j}} = D'_{\mathbf{j}}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.18.** *Let  $(K, \mathbb{D})$  be an  $F$ -field and let  $\partial_1, \dots, \partial_{p^e}$  be all different elements of  $\{D_{(i_0, \dots, i_e)} \mid i_0, \dots, i_e < p\}$ . Take any  $x_1, \dots, x_n \in K$ . Elements  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  are linearly dependent over  $C_K$  if and only if the rank of the matrix  $(\partial_i(x_j))_{i \leq p^e, j \leq n}$  is smaller than  $n$ .*

*Proof.* The proof of [1, Proposition 3.20] works well for the above, more general lemma.  $\square$

**Corollary 2.19.** *For every  $F$ -field extension  $K \subseteq L$ ,  $K$  and  $C_L$  are linearly disjoint over  $C_K$ .*

**Definition 2.20.** We call an  $F$ -field  $(K, \mathbb{D})$  *strict* if  $C_K = K^p$ .

**Remark 2.21.** Let  $K \subseteq L$  be an  $F$ -field extension. If  $K$  is strict, then  $K \subseteq L$  is separable.

*Proof.* By Corollary 2.19,  $K$  and  $L^p \subseteq C_L$  are linearly disjoint over  $K^p = C_K$ , so by [5, Theorem 26.4]  $L$  is separable over  $K$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.22.** *For any  $F$ -field  $(K, \mathbb{D})$  we have  $[K : C_K] \leq p^e$ .*

*Proof.* It follows from Lemma 2.18.  $\square$

**2.3. Commutative HS-derivations.** In this subsection we deal with formulas for  $D_{\mathbf{i}}^{(p)}$  (the  $p$ -th composition) in the case of an  $F$ -derivation  $\mathbb{D} = (D_{\mathbf{i}})_{\mathbf{i} \in [p^m]^e}$  for a commutative  $F$ . The main idea follows Section 3.3. in [2], but improves the reasoning of [2, Proposition 3.11] and [2, Remark 3.12.(4)]. The idea to focus on the ring of symmetric polynomials comes from Piotr Kowalski. We assume only that  $F(\bar{v}, \bar{w}) \in (k[\bar{v}, \bar{w}])^e$  is commutative and that  $(R, \mathbb{D})$  is an  $F$ -ring. Obviously:

**Fact 2.23.** *We have the following*

$$D_{\mathbf{j}} \circ D_{\mathbf{i}} = D_{\mathbf{i}} \circ D_{\mathbf{j}}.$$

For every  $N \geq 1$  we introduce the following  $k$ -algebra homomorphism

$$E_N : R[\bar{v}_1, \dots, \bar{v}_{N-1}] \rightarrow R[\bar{v}_1, \dots, \bar{v}_N],$$

$$E_N = \mathbb{D}_{\bar{v}_N}[\bar{v}_1, \dots, \bar{v}_{N-1}],$$

where  $\bar{v}_1, \dots, \bar{v}_N$  are  $e$ -tuples of  $m$ -truncated variables and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{D}_{\bar{v}_N}[\bar{v}_1, \dots, \bar{v}_{N-1}] \left( \sum_{\mathbf{i}_1, \dots, \mathbf{i}_{N-1}} \alpha_{\mathbf{i}_1, \dots, \mathbf{i}_{N-1}} \bar{v}_1^{\mathbf{i}_1} \cdot \dots \cdot \bar{v}_{N-1}^{\mathbf{i}_{N-1}} \right) &= \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{i}_1, \dots, \mathbf{i}_N} D_{\mathbf{i}_N}(\alpha_{\mathbf{i}_1, \dots, \mathbf{i}_{N-1}}) \bar{v}_1^{\mathbf{i}_1} \cdot \dots \cdot \bar{v}_N^{\mathbf{i}_N}. \end{aligned}$$

For  $N \geq 1$  we define inductively

$$F_1(\bar{v}_1) := \bar{v}_1,$$

$$F_{N+1}(\bar{v}_1, \dots, \bar{v}_{N+1}) := F_N(\bar{v}_1, \dots, \bar{v}_{N-1}, F(\bar{v}_N, \bar{v}_{N+1})).$$

**Lemma 2.24.** *For every  $N \geq 1$  the following diagram commutes*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} R & \xrightarrow{E_N \circ \dots \circ E_1} & R[\bar{v}_1, \dots, \bar{v}_N] \\ & \searrow E_1 & \nearrow \text{ev}_{F_N} \\ & R[\bar{v}_1] & \end{array}$$

*Proof.* It is clear for  $N = 1$ , so assume for the induction step that the last diagram is commutative. Consider

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} R & \xrightarrow{E_{N-1} \circ \dots \circ E_1} & R[\bar{v}_1, \dots, \bar{v}_{N-1}] & \xrightarrow{E_N} & R[\bar{v}_1, \dots, \bar{v}_N] \\ E_1 \downarrow & & E_N \downarrow & & \downarrow E_{N+1} \\ R[\bar{v}_1] & \xrightarrow{\text{ev}_{F_N}} & R[\bar{v}_1, \dots, \bar{v}_N] & \xrightarrow{\text{ev}_{(\bar{v}_1, \dots, \bar{v}_{N-1}, F(\bar{v}_N, \bar{v}_{N+1}))}} & R[\bar{v}_1, \dots, \bar{v}_{N+1}] \end{array}$$

Left part is commutative by the inductive assumption. For commutativity of the right side, just apply the functor

$$R \rightarrow R[\bar{v}_1, \dots, \bar{v}_{N-1}]$$

to the diagram from the  $F$ -iterativity definition and change  $\bar{v}$ ,  $\bar{w}$  to  $\bar{v}_N$ ,  $\bar{v}_{N+1}$ . Finally

$$\text{ev}_{(\bar{v}_1, \dots, \bar{v}_{N-1}, F(\bar{v}_N, \bar{v}_{N+1}))} \circ \text{ev}_{F_N} = \text{ev}_{F_{N+1}}.$$

□

Note that the following composition of mappings

$$R \xrightarrow{E_1} R[\bar{v}_1] \xrightarrow{E_2} R[\bar{v}_1, \bar{v}_2] \rightarrow \dots \xrightarrow{E_p} R[\bar{v}_1, \dots, \bar{v}_p]$$

is a  $k$ -algebra homomorphism such that  $\text{im}(E_p \circ \dots \circ E_1)$  is a subset of the ring of symmetric polynomials in  $\bar{v}_1, \dots, \bar{v}_p$ , i.e.: elements of  $R[\bar{v}_1, \dots, \bar{v}_p]$  invariant under the action of  $S_p$ ,

$$\sigma : \bar{v}_i = (v_{i,1}, \dots, v_{i,e}) \mapsto \bar{v}_{\sigma(i)} = (v_{\sigma(i),1}, \dots, v_{\sigma(i),e}),$$

for  $\sigma \in S_p$  and  $i \leq p$ . In other words the map  $E_p \circ \dots \circ E_1$  factors as in following the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} R & \xrightarrow{\quad \quad \quad} & R[\bar{v}_1, \dots, \bar{v}_p]^{S_p} \\ & \searrow E_p \circ \dots \circ E_1 & \downarrow \subseteq \\ & & R[\bar{v}_1, \dots, \bar{v}_p] \end{array}$$

For  $\varphi : R[\bar{v}_1, \dots, \bar{v}_p]^{S_p} \rightarrow R[\bar{v}_1^{\frac{1}{p}}]$ , given by  $v_{i,j} \mapsto v_{1,j}^{\frac{1}{p}}$ , where  $i \leq p$  and  $j \leq e$ , also the map  $\varphi$  factors as in the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} R[\bar{v}_1, \dots, \bar{v}_p]^{S_p} & \xrightarrow{\quad \quad \quad} & R[\bar{v}_1] \\ & \searrow \varphi & \downarrow \subseteq \\ & & R[\bar{v}_1^{\frac{1}{p}}] \end{array}$$

Therefore  $\varphi : \text{im}(E_p \circ \dots \circ E_1) \rightarrow R[\bar{v}_1]$ , defined is a well-defined  $k$ -algebra homomorphism.

For any  $N \geq 1$  we define inductively the “multiplication by  $N$  map”:

$$[1]_F := \bar{v},$$

$$[N+1]_F := F(\bar{v}, [N]_F).$$

For example  $[2]_F = F(\bar{v}, \bar{v})$ .

**Corollary 2.25.** *For any  $r \in R$  we have*

$$\sum_{\mathbf{i}} D_{\mathbf{i}}^{(p)}(r) \bar{v}^{\mathbf{i}} = \text{ev}_{[p]_F(\bar{v}^{1/p})} \left( \sum_{\mathbf{i}} D_{\mathbf{i}}(r) \bar{v}^{\mathbf{i}} \right).$$

*Proof.* By Lemma 2.24 we know that

$$E_p \circ \dots \circ E_1(r) = \text{ev}_{F_p} \circ E_1(r),$$

so

$$\sum_{\mathbf{i}} D_{\mathbf{i}}^{(p)}(r) \bar{v}_1^{\mathbf{i}} = \varphi \circ E_p \circ \dots \circ E_1(r) = \varphi \circ \text{ev}_{F_p} \circ E_1(r) = \text{ev}_{[p]_F(\bar{v}_1^{1/p})} \left( \sum_{\mathbf{i}} D_{\mathbf{i}}(r) \bar{v}_1^{\mathbf{i}} \right).$$

The first equality is similar to [2, Lemma 3.7], the last follows from definitions of  $[p]_F$ ,  $F_p$  and  $\varphi$ . For example let  $p = 2$ :

$$\varphi \circ \text{ev}_{F_2(\bar{v}_1, \bar{v}_2)} = \text{ev}_{F_2(\bar{v}_1^{1/2}, \bar{v}_1^{1/2})} = \text{ev}_{[2]_F(\bar{v}_1^{1/2})}.$$

□



3. CANONICAL  $G$ -BASES AND THE INTEGRABILITY

The results of this section focus on proving the integrability for a field equipped with an iterative HS-derivation and endowed with a  $p$ -basis of a special kind. For the notion of  $p$ -independence,  $p$ -basis and their basic properties, the reader is referred to [5, p. 202.]. Recall that  $k$  is a perfect field. Assume that  $G$  is an algebraic group over  $k$  of dimension  $e$  (perhaps not commutative). We will write  $G[m]$ -derivation,  $G[m]$ -ring,  $G[m]$ -field,  $\dots$  instead of  $\hat{G}[m]$ -derivation,  $\hat{G}[m]$ -ring,  $\hat{G}[m]$ -field,  $\dots$

Let  $(K, \mathbb{D})$  be a  $G[m]$ -field. For every  $s \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}$  we introduce

$$F_s := \bigcap_{j=0}^s C_{(p^j, 0, \dots, 0)} \cap C_{(0, p^j, 0, \dots, 0)} \cap \dots \cap C_{(0, \dots, 0, p^j)}, \quad F_{-1} := K.$$

**Remark 3.1.** Sets  $F_s$  are, due to Fact 2.17, subfields of  $K$ . In fact  $F_s$  is equal to the field of constants of order  $s$  (the absolute constants of  $\mathbb{D}[s+1]$ ).

For the clarity of next proofs, we note an obvious fact:

**Fact 3.2.** *Let  $L \subseteq L'$  be a fields extension. If  $y \in L^{\frac{1}{p}} \setminus L \subseteq L'$ , then  $[L(y) : L] = p$ .*

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $z_1, \dots, z_e \in K$  form a  $p$ -basis of (or equivalently, by Lemma 2.22, “are  $p$ -independent in”)  $K$  over  $C_K = F_0$ . For every  $s \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}$  we have*

$$[F_{s-1} : F_s] = p^e, \quad F_{s-1} = F_s(z_1^{p^s}, \dots, z_e^{p^s}).$$

*Proof.* Being a  $p$ -basis for  $K$  over  $F_0$ , due to  $K^p \subseteq F_0$ , means that  $K = F_0(z_1, \dots, z_e)$  and that  $[F_0(z_1, \dots, z_e) : F_0] = p^e$ . Notice that, by Lemma 3.31 from [1] and Lemma 2.22,

$$[F_s(z_1^{p^s}, \dots, z_e^{p^s}) : F_s] \leq [F_{s-1} : F_s] \leq p^e.$$

It is enough to show that  $[F_s(z_1^{p^s}, \dots, z_e^{p^s}) : F_s] = p^e$ . We know that  $\{z_1^{i_1} \dots z_e^{i_e} \mid 0 \leq i_1, \dots, i_e < p\}$  is  $F_0$ -linearly independent, thus  $\{z_1^{i_1 p^s} \dots z_e^{i_e p^s} \mid 0 \leq i_1, \dots, i_e < p\}$  is  $F_0^{p^s}$ -linearly independent. Consider

$$(K^{p^s}, \mathbb{D}[s+1]|_{K^{p^s}}) \subseteq (F_{s-1}, \mathbb{D}[s+1]|_{F_{s-1}}).$$

By [1, Lemma 3.31], it is an extension of  $G[1]^{\text{Fr}^{p^s}}$ -fields. Therefore, by Corollary 2.19,  $K^{p^s}$  is linearly disjoint from constants of  $\mathbb{D}[s+1]|_{F_{s-1}}$  over constants of  $\mathbb{D}[s+1]|_{K^{p^s}}$ . So  $F_0^{p^s}$ -linear independence of  $\{z_1^{i_1 p^s} \dots z_e^{i_e p^s} \mid 0 \leq i_1, \dots, i_e < p\}$  implies it  $F_s$ -linear independence. Hence  $[F_s(z_1^{p^s}, \dots, z_e^{p^s}) : F_s] = p^e$ .  $\square$

**Remark 3.4.** The equality

$$[F_{s-1} : F_s] = p^e,$$

where  $s \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}$ , does not depend on the choice of a  $p$ -basis. Therefore it is true if  $[K : C_K] = p^e$ .

**Proposition 3.5.** *Let  $z_1, \dots, z_e \in K$  form a  $p$ -basis of (or equivalently “are  $p$ -independent in”)  $K$  over  $C_K = F_0$ . Then there exists a subset  $\mathcal{B}_0 \subseteq C_K^{ab} = F_{m-1}$ , for which  $\mathcal{B} := \mathcal{B}_0 \cup \{z_1, \dots, z_e\}$  is a  $p$ -basis for  $K$  over  $k$ .*

*Proof.* In particular, Lemma 3.3 implies that the set  $\{z_1^{p^m}, \dots, z_e^{p^m}\}$  is  $p$ -independent over  $k$  in  $F_{m-1}$ . Let  $\mathcal{B}'$  be a  $p$ -basis  $\mathcal{B}'$  of the field  $F_{m-1}$  over  $k$  of the form  $\mathcal{B}' = \mathcal{B}_0 \cup \{z_1^{p^m}, \dots, z_e^{p^m}\}$ . We will show that  $\mathcal{B} := \mathcal{B}_0 \cup \{z_1, \dots, z_e\}$  is a  $p$ -basis of

$K$  over  $k$ . Since for  $s = m$ ,  $\mathcal{B}_0 \cup \{z_1^{p^m}, \dots, z_e^{p^m}\} = \mathcal{B}'$  is, as above, a  $p$ -basis for  $F_{m-1}$  over  $k$ , it is enough to show the following induction step

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{if } \mathcal{B}_0 \cup \{z_1^{p^s}, \dots, z_e^{p^s}\} \text{ is } p\text{-basis for } F_{s-1} \text{ over } k, \\ & \text{then } \mathcal{B}_0 \cup \{z_1^{p^{s-1}}, \dots, z_e^{p^{s-1}}\} \text{ is } p\text{-basis for } F_{s-2} \text{ over } k, \end{aligned}$$

where  $s$  descends from  $m$  to 1.

Firstly, we argue for the  $p$ -independence of  $\mathcal{B}_0$  in  $F_{s-2}$ . For any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and pairwise distinct  $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathcal{B}_0$ , by Lemma 3.3, we have

$$[F_{s-2}^p(x_1, \dots, x_n) : F_{s-1}^p] = [F_{s-1}^p(z_1^{p^s}, \dots, z_e^{p^s}, x_1, \dots, x_n) : F_{s-1}^p] = p^{n+e},$$

using Lemma 3.3 again, we get

$$\begin{aligned} p^{n+e} &= [F_{s-2}^p(x_1, \dots, x_n) : F_{s-2}^p] \cdot [F_{s-1}^p(z_1^{p^s}, \dots, z_e^{p^s}) : F_{s-1}^p] \\ &= [F_{s-2}^p(x_1, \dots, x_n) : F_{s-2}^p] \cdot p^e. \end{aligned}$$

Elements  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  were choosen arbitrary, so indeed  $\mathcal{B}_0$  is  $p$ -independent over  $k$  in  $F_{s-2}$ .

We will show now the  $p$ -independence of  $\mathcal{B}_0 \cup \{z_1^{p^{s-1}}, \dots, z_e^{p^{s-1}}\}$  in  $F_{s-2}$ . For any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , pairwise distinct  $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathcal{B}_0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & [F_{s-2}^p(z_1^{p^{s-1}}, \dots, z_e^{p^{s-1}}, x_1, \dots, x_n) : F_{s-2}^p] = \\ &= [F_{s-2}^p(z_1^{p^{s-1}}, \dots, z_e^{p^{s-1}}, x_1, \dots, x_n) : F_{s-2}^p(x_1, \dots, x_n)] \cdot [F_{s-2}^p(x_1, \dots, x_n) : F_{s-2}^p]. \end{aligned}$$

To show the  $p$ -independence of  $\mathcal{B}_0 \cup \{z_1^{p^{s-1}}, \dots, z_e^{p^{s-1}}\}$  over  $k$  in  $F_{s-2}$  we need only to prove

$$[F_{s-2}^p(z_1^{p^{s-1}}, \dots, z_e^{p^{s-1}}, x_1, \dots, x_n) : F_{s-2}^p(x_1, \dots, x_n)] = p^e.$$

By Fact 3.2 it reduces to show that for each  $i \leq e$  we have

$$z_i^{p^{s-1}} \notin F_{s-2}^p(z_{i+1}^{p^{s-1}}, \dots, z_e^{p^{s-1}}, x_1, \dots, x_n)$$

(clearly  $z_i^{p^s} \in F_{s-2}^p$ ). It holds due to Lemma 3.3 and  $F_{s-2}^p(z_{i+1}^{p^{s-1}}, \dots, z_e^{p^{s-1}}, x_1, \dots, x_n) \subseteq F_{s-1}^p(z_{i+1}^{p^{s-1}}, \dots, z_e^{p^{s-1}})$ .

Finally, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} F_{s-2} &= F_{s-1}(z_1^{p^{s-1}}, \dots, z_e^{p^{s-1}}) \\ &= F_{s-1}^p(\mathcal{B}_0 \cup \{z_1^{p^s}, \dots, z_e^{p^s}\})(z_1^{p^{s-1}}, \dots, z_e^{p^{s-1}}) \\ &= F_{s-1}^p(z_1^{p^s}, \dots, z_e^{p^s})(\mathcal{B}_0 \cup \{z_1^{p^{s-1}}, \dots, z_e^{p^{s-1}}\}) \\ &= F_{s-2}^p(\mathcal{B}_0 \cup \{z_1^{p^{s-1}}, \dots, z_e^{p^{s-1}}\}), \end{aligned}$$

and that ends proof of the induction, after last step we obtain that  $\mathcal{B}_0 \cup \{z_1, \dots, z_e\}$  is a  $p$ -basis for  $F_{1-2} = K$  over  $k$ .  $\square$

In the spirit of [1, definition 6.1] we introduce the following term:

**Definition 3.6.** Let  $(K, \mathbb{D}[m])$  be a  $G[m]$ -field. A subset  $B \subseteq K$  is called *canonical  $G$ -basis* if

- $|B| = e$ ,
- $B$  is  $p$ -independent in  $K$  over  $C_K$ ,

- there is an embedding of  $G[m]$ -fields  $(k(G), \mathbb{D}^G[m]) \rightarrow (K, \mathbb{D}[m])$  (see Example 2.12) such that  $B$  is the image of the set of canonical parameters of  $G$  corresponding to the canonical  $G$ -derivation.

**Example 3.7.** Let us take  $G = \mathbb{G}_a^e$ . By [5, Theorem 27.3] and Lemma 4.15 if  $[K : C_K] = p^e$  then  $(K, \mathbb{D}[m])$  has a canonical  $\mathbb{G}_a^e$ -basis. This fact was used in [11], to obtain the quantifier elimination for the theory of separable closed strict  $\mathbb{G}_a^e$ -fields, satisfying  $[K : C_K] = p^e$ .

**Theorem 3.8.** *Assume that a  $G[m]$ -field  $(K, \mathbb{D}[m])$  has a canonical  $G$ -basis, then  $\mathbb{D}[m]$  is strongly integrable.*

*Proof.* Let  $B = \{z_1, \dots, z_e\}$  be a canonical  $G$ -basis of  $(K, \mathbb{D}[m])$  and let  $\bar{X}$  be an  $e$ -tuple of variables. By a choice of local parameters of  $G$  at identity we get an embedding  $k(\bar{X}) \subseteq k(G)$ . Proposition 3.5 assures the existence of a set  $B_0 \subseteq C_K^{\text{ab}}$  such that  $B_0 \cup B$  is a  $p$ -basis of  $K$  over  $k$ . Let  $K' := k(B_0)$ . Because  $B_0 \cup B$  is algebraically independent over  $k$ ,  $B_0$  is algebraically independent over  $k(B)$ . Moreover  $k(B) \cong k(\bar{X}) \subset k(G)$  is an algebraic extension, thus  $B_0$  is algebraically independent over  $k(G)$ . Therefore  $K'$  and  $k(G)$  are linearly disjoint over  $k$ , so the “multiplication” map  $\mu : k(G) \otimes_k K' \rightarrow K$  is an injection, and therefore it extends to  $\tilde{\mu} : (k(G) \otimes_k K')_0 \rightarrow K$ .

By [5, Theorem 26.8],  $K'(B)$  is purely transcendental over  $K'$  and  $K'(B) \subseteq K$  is 0-étale. Hence we have  $K'(B) \cong K'(\bar{X}) \cong (k(\bar{X}) \otimes_k K')_0 \subseteq (k(G) \otimes_k K')_0$  ( $k(G) \otimes_k K'$  is a domain as a subring of  $K$ ). Therefore we have a natural mapping  $K'(B) \rightarrow (k(G) \otimes_k K')_0 =: K'(G)$ .

Note that the following diagram commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & K'(G) & \\ \nearrow & & \searrow \tilde{\mu} \\ K'(B) & \xrightarrow{\subseteq} & K \end{array}$$

The extension of fields  $K'(B) \subseteq K$  is smooth, and by [5, Theorem 26.9] it is also separable. In particular,  $K'(G)$  is separable over  $K'(B)$ . The algebraicity of the extension  $k(B) \subseteq k(G)$  implies the algebraicity of the extension  $K'(B) \subseteq K'(G)$ , and that, due to [5, Theorem 26.1], means that  $K'(B) \subseteq K'(G)$  is 0-étale. Therefore also  $\tilde{\mu} : K'(G) \rightarrow K$  is 0-étale. We have the following tower of  $k$ -algebras

$$k(G) \otimes_k K' \subseteq (k(G) \otimes_k K')_0 = K'(G) \xrightarrow{\tilde{\mu}} K,$$

where both extensions are 0-étale. By [5, Theorem 26.7]  $k(G) \otimes_k K' \xrightarrow{\mu} K$  is 0-étale.

Now we are going to define a  $G$ -ring structure on  $R := k(G) \otimes_k K'$ . For every  $\mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{N}^e$ ,  $v \in k(G)$  and  $w \in K'$  we define

$$D'_{\mathbf{i}}(v \otimes w) := D'_{\mathbf{i}}(v) \otimes w.$$

Note that for every  $\mathbf{i} \in [p^m]^e$ , we have  $\mu \circ D'_{\mathbf{i}} = D_{\mathbf{i}} \circ \mu$ . Thus  $(R, \mathbb{D}'[m]) \xrightarrow{\mu} (K, \mathbb{D})$  is a  $G[m]$ -morphism. By Lemma 2.13 for  $(R, \mathbb{D})$ , there exists a unique  $G$ -derivation  $\tilde{\mathbb{D}}$  on  $K$ . Since both  $\mathbb{D}$  and  $\tilde{\mathbb{D}}[m]$  extend  $\mathbb{D}'[m]$ , by Lemma 2.13 for every  $\mathbf{i} \in [p^m]^e$  we have  $D_{\mathbf{i}} = \tilde{D}_{\mathbf{i}}$ .  $\square$

**Remark 3.9.** The converse to Theorem 3.8 is not true in general. First of all, we need enough “space” to have a canonical  $G$ -basis, so we assume

$$(2) \quad [K : C_K] = p^e$$

for an integrable  $G[m]$ -field  $(K, \mathbb{D})$ . For example  $D_{\mathbf{i}} = 0$ , for all  $\mathbf{i} \neq \mathbf{0}$ , is integrable, but  $[K : C_K] = 1$  and there are not enough  $p$ -independent elements to form a  $G$ -basis. Equality (2) in dimension  $e = 1$  means that  $D_1 \neq 0$  and such an assumption is needed in [5, Theorem 27.3.(ii)] to obtain the existence of a one-element canonical basis. Hence it is morally justified to assume (2) in the next Section, where we find a canonical  $G$ -basis for a special algebraic group  $G$ . Perhaps there are no general reasons for the converse theorem to hold and finding a canonical  $G$ -basis is the only possibility for proving the existence of such a basis for a given algebraic group  $G$ .

#### 4. NEW EXAMPLES OF GROUPS WITH CANONICAL $G$ -BASES

**4.1. Unipotent groups of dimension two.** In this subsection, we are going to find a canonical  $G$ -basis for an algebraic group  $G$  of a special type. Firstly we provide a well known fact about derivations, then define  $G$  and its group law. After this we specify which tuples satisfy the canonical  $G$ -basis condition in this case and prove the existence of such basis for a  $G[m]$ -field  $(K, \mathbb{D})$  satisfying  $[K : C_K] = p^e$ .

**Fact 4.1.** *Let  $L$  be a field,  $\partial \in \text{Der}_C(L)$ ,  $\ker \partial = C \neq L$ ,  $\partial^{(p)} = 0$ , then*

- i) *there exists an element  $z \in L$  such that  $\partial(z) = 1$ , and  $1, z, z^2, \dots, z^{p-1}$  form  $C$ -linear basis of  $L$ ,*
- ii)  $\ker \partial^{(p-1)} = \text{im } \partial$ .

*Proof.* The first item is contained in [5, Theorem 27.3]. The second item is in [10, Lemma 3.], but for reader’s convenience, we include a short proof. The derivation  $\partial$  is a  $C$ -linear map, after computing  $\partial$  on  $1, z, z^2, \dots, z^{p-1}$  we see that  $\dim_C \ker \partial = 1$ . Therefore  $\dim_C \text{im } \partial = p - 1$ , moreover  $\dim_C \ker \partial^{(p-1)} \leq p - 1$ . The condition  $\partial^{(p)} = 0$  implies that  $\text{im } \partial \subseteq \ker \partial^{(p-1)}$ , but  $\dim_C \ker \partial^{(p-1)} \leq \dim_C \text{im } \partial$ .  $\square$

For  $i \leq p$  let  $\lambda_i$  be the image in  $\mathbb{F}_p$  of  $\frac{1}{p} \binom{p}{i}$ . Following the page 171. from [6], we define

$$\begin{aligned} H_n(X_2, Y_2) &:= \left[ \frac{1}{p} \left( (X_2 + Y_2)^p - X_2^p - Y_2^p \right) \right]^{p^n} = \\ &= \frac{1}{p} \left( (X_2^{p^n} + Y_2^{p^n})^p - X_2^{p^{n+1}} - Y_2^{p^{n+1}} \right) \in \mathbb{F}_p[X_2, Y_2], \\ H_n(X_2, Y_2) &= \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} \lambda_i X_2^{ip^n} Y_2^{(p-i)p^n}. \end{aligned}$$

Consider the extension of commutative algebraic groups

$$0 \rightarrow \mathbb{G}_a \rightarrow G \rightarrow \mathbb{G}_a \rightarrow 0,$$

where the group operation  $*$  on  $G$  is given by

$$(X_1, X_2) * (Y_1, Y_2) = F(X_1, X_2, Y_1, Y_2) := (X_1 + Y_1 + \sum_{n=0}^M \alpha_n H_n(X_2, Y_2), X_2 + Y_2),$$

for a fixed  $M \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\alpha_i \in k$  for  $i \leq M$ . We are interested in the following  $m$ -truncation

$$F[m](v_1, v_2, w_1, w_2) = (v_1 + w_1 + \sum_{n=0}^N \alpha_n H_n(v_2, w_2), v_2 + w_2),$$

where  $v_1, v_2, w_1$  and  $w_2$  are  $m$ -truncated variables and  $N := \min\{M, m-1\}$ . Without loss of generality we will assume that  $N = m-1$ . Let  $(K, \mathbb{D})$  be a  $G[m]$ -field (i.e.  $(K, \mathbb{D})$  is a  $\hat{G}[m]$ -field, but  $\hat{G} = \hat{F} = F$ , so we consider just an  $F[m]$ -field), such that  $[K : C_K] = p^2$ .

**Lemma 4.2.** *We have the following*

- i)  $D_{(i,j)} = D_{(i,0)} D_{(0,j)} = D_{(0,j)} D_{(i,0)}$ ,
- ii)  $D_{(i_2,0)} \circ D_{(i_1,0)} = \binom{i_1+i_2}{i_1} D_{(i_1+i_2,0)}$ .
- iii)  $[p]_{F[m]}(v_1, v_2) = (-\sum_{n=0}^N \alpha_n v_2^{p^{n+1}}, 0)$ ,
- iv)  $D_{(i,j)}^{(p)} = 0$  for every  $i, j \leq p^{m-1}$  such that  $i \neq 0$ ,
- v) if  $j < m$  then

$$D_{(0,p^j)}^{(p)} = -\alpha_j D_{(1,0)} + \sum_{n=p}^{p^j} \beta_n D_{(n,0)},$$

for some  $\beta_n \in k$ .

*Proof.* The first two items are easy. For the proof of third item it is sufficient to prove inductively the following

$$[l]_F(v_1, v_2) = (lv_1 + \sum_{n=0}^N \alpha_n \left[\left(\frac{1}{p}(l^p - l)\right)v_2^p\right]^{p^n}, lv_2).$$

The fourth and the fifth item use the third part and Corollary 2.25. Specifically, one needs to show

$$D_{(0,j)}^{(p)} = \sum_{i_0+i_1p+\dots+i_Np^N=j} (-1)^{i_0+\dots+i_N} \cdot \frac{(i_0+\dots+i_N)!}{i_0! \cdot \dots \cdot i_N!} \alpha_0^{i_0} \cdot \dots \cdot \alpha_N^{i_N} D_{(i_0+\dots+i_N,0)},$$

for every  $j \leq p^{m-1}$ . We leave it to the reader.  $\square$

Let us consider the canonical  $F$ -derivation from Example 2.10:

$$\text{ev}_F : k[[X_1, X_2]] \rightarrow (k[[X_1, X_2]])[[Y_1, Y_2]],$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} X_1 &\mapsto X_1 + Y_1 + \sum_{n=0}^N \alpha_n \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} \lambda_i X_2^{ip^n} Y_2^{(p-i)p^n}, \\ X_2 &\mapsto X_2 + Y_2. \end{aligned}$$

As in Example 2.12, the above  $F$ -derivation could be considered as a  $G$ -derivation on  $k(G)$  (because  $F = \hat{G}$ ). In this situation  $k(G) = k(X_1, X_2)$ , so we need to find an embedding  $\varphi$  of  $(k(X_1, X_2), \mathbb{D}^G[m])$  in  $(K, \mathbb{D})$  such that for  $x = \varphi(X_1)$  and  $y = \varphi(X_2)$  we have

- i)  $[C_K(x, y) : C_K] = p^2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ii)} \quad & \sum_{i,j=0}^{p^m-1} D_{(i,j)}(x) v_1^i v_2^j = x + v_1 + \sum_{n=0}^N \alpha_n \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} \lambda_i y^{ip^n} v_2^{(p-i)p^n}, \\ \text{iii)} \quad & \sum_{i,j=0}^{p^m-1} D_{(i,j)}(y) v_1^i v_2^j = y + v_2. \end{aligned}$$

The conditions i), ii) and iii) above are equivalent to

$$D_{(1,0)}(x) = 1, \quad D_{(0,1)}(x) = \alpha_0 \lambda_1 y^{p-1}, \quad \dots,$$

$$D_{(p^n,0)}(x) = 0, \quad D_{(0,p^n)}(x) = \alpha_n \lambda_1 y^{(p-1)p^n}, \quad \dots$$

$$D_{(1,0)}(y) = 0, \quad D_{(0,1)}(y) = 1, \quad D_{(p,0)}(y) = 0, \quad D_{(0,p)}(y) = 0, \quad \dots$$

(since  $D_{(1,0)}(x) = 1$ ,  $D_{(1,0)}(y) = 0$  and  $D_{(0,1)}(y) = 1$  imply, by Fact 3.2, that  $[C_K(x, y) : C_K] = p^2$ ). We are concerned now only with the terms of the form  $D_{(p^i,0)}$  and  $D_{(0,p^j)}$ . It will turn out later that it is enough to consider such terms to obtain expected  $G$ -basis. Recall that  $G$  is commutative, so each subset of constants is preserved, i.e.:

$$D_{(i,j)}(C_{(i',j')}) \subseteq C_{(i',j')},$$

for every  $i, j, i', j' < p^m$ .

Recall also that  $[F_{s-1} : F_s] = p^2$  for every  $s \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}$  (Remark 3.4).

**Fact 4.3.** *There exists  $x, y \in K$  such that  $D_{(1,0)}(x) = 1$ ,  $D_{(1,0)}(y) = 0$  and  $D_{(0,1)}(y) = 1$ .*

*Proof.* Note that  $D_{(1,0)} \in \text{Der}_{C_{(1,0)}}(F_{-1})$  and  $D_{(1,0)}^{(p)} = 0$ , so we can use Lemma 2.22 and obtain  $[F_{-1} : C_{(1,0)}] \leq p$  (Lemma 2.22 works for iterative HS-derivations, but by [5, Theorem 27.4],  $D_{(1,0)}^{(p)} = 0$  implies  $\mathbb{G}_a$ -iterativity). Moreover, from Lemma 4.2,

$$D_{(0,1)}^{(p)}|_{C_{(1,0)}} = -\alpha_0 D_{(1,0)}|_{C_{(1,0)}} = 0,$$

so similarly  $[C_{(1,0)} : F_0] \leq p$ . Since  $[F_{-1} : F_0] = [K : C_K] = p^2$ , both  $D_{(1,0)} \in \text{Der}_{C_{(1,0)}}(F_{-1})$  and  $D_{(0,1)}|_{C_{(1,0)}} \in \text{Der}_{F_0}(C_{(1,0)})$  are non-zero, so they satisfy assumptions of Fact 4.1.i).  $\square$

**Lemma 4.4.** *Let  $n \geq 0$  and  $i, j < p^{n+1}$ , be such that  $(i, j) \neq (0, 0)$ . Then we have  $F_n \subseteq C_{(i,j)}$ .*

*Proof.* We argue inductively on  $l = i + j$  to show that  $D_{(i,j)}|_{F_n} = 0$  for  $i, j < p^{n+1}$  such that  $(i, j) \neq (0, 0)$ . For  $l = 1$  it is clear. Assume that  $i, j < p^{n+1}$ ,  $(i, j) \neq (0, 0)$  and for every  $i' + j' < i + j$  such that  $(i', j') \neq (0, 0)$  we have  $D_{(i',j')}|_{F_n} = 0$ . If  $i = \gamma_0 + \dots + \gamma_r p^r$ ,  $j = \beta_0 + \dots + \beta_s p^s$ ,  $r, s \leq n$ ,  $0 \leq \gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_r, \beta_0, \dots, \beta_s < p$ , and  $\gamma_r, \beta_s \neq 0$ , then from Fact 2.16

$$\gamma_r \beta_s D_{(i,j)} = D_{(i-p^r, j-p^s)} \circ D_{(p^r, p^s)} - \mathcal{O}(D_{(i',j')})_{0 < i' + j' < i + j}.$$

By Lemma 4.2  $F_n \subseteq \ker D_{(p^r,0)} \subseteq \ker D_{(p^r, p^s)}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 4.5.** *For each  $n \geq -1$  sets  $F_n$  and  $F_n \cap C_{(p^{n+1},0)}$  are subfields of  $K$ .*

*Proof.* By Remark 3.1  $F_n$  is a subfield. Using Lemma 4.4, we get that  $D_{(p^{n+1},0)}|_{F_n} \in \text{Der}(F_n)$  and therefore  $\ker D_{(p^{n+1},0)}|_{F_n}$ , equal to  $F_n \cap C_{(p^{n+1},0)}$ , also is a subfield.  $\square$

4.1.1. *Finding  $y$ .*

**Fact 4.6.** *There exists an element  $y \in K$  such that*

- i)  $D_{(1,0)}(y) = 0$  and  $D_{(0,1)}(y) = 1$ ,
- ii) *for every  $0 < n < m$  we have  $D_{(p^n,0)}(y) = D_{(0,p^n)}(y) = 0$ .*

*Proof.* For the proof of i) consider the element  $y \in K$  from Fact 4.3. For the proof of ii) we will inductively correct  $y$ . Take the maximal  $0 < l < m$  such that for every  $0 < l' < l$

$$D_{(p^{l'},0)}(y) = D_{(0,p^{l'})}(y) = 0.$$

Assume that  $D_{(p^l,0)}(y) \neq 0$  or  $D_{(0,p^l)}(y) \neq 0$ , otherwise we have nothing to do.

Let  $D_{(p^l,0)}(y) \neq 0$ , clearly  $D_{(p^l,0)}(y) \in F_{l-1}$ , so  $D_{(p^l,0)}(y) \in \ker D_{(p^l,0)}|_{F_{l-1}}^{(p-1)}$  equal, due to Fact 4.1, to the image of  $D_{(p^l,0)}|_{F_{l-1}}$ . There exists  $z \in F_{l-1}$  such that  $D_{(p^l,0)}(y) = D_{(p^l,0)}(z)$ . We exchange  $y$  with  $y - z$ .

Now let  $D_{(p^l,0)}(y) = 0$  and  $D_{(0,p^l)}(y) \neq 0$ . We have  $D_{(0,p^l)}(y) \in F_{l-1} \cap C_{(p^l,0)}$  and as before  $D_{(0,p^l)}(y) \in \ker D_{(0,p^l)}|_{F_{l-1} \cap C_{(p^l,0)}}^{(p-1)}$ . Again, we would like to use Fact 4.1, so it is enough to check that  $D_{(0,p^l)}|_{F_{l-1} \cap C_{(p^l,0)}}^{(p)} = 0$ , which follows from Lemma 4.2 and Lemma 4.4.  $\square$

For the rest of this subsection we fix  $y \in K$  as in the fact above.

**Remark 4.7.** If  $p^q \leq n < p^{q+1}$  and  $D_{(p^q,0)}(a) = 0$ , then also  $D_{(n,0)}(a) = 0$ .

*Proof.* It is a property of the standard iterativity rule.  $\square$

The values of  $D_{(p^n,0)}$  and  $D_{(0,p^n)}$  ( $n < m$ ) at the element  $y$  determine the value of  $D_{(i,j)}$  (for every  $(i,j)$ ) at  $y$ , which we show below. Moreover, the proposition below assures us that  $y$  fulfils the canonical  $G$ -basis conditions.

**Proposition 4.8.** *We have the following*

- i) *for all  $n > 0$   $D_{(n,0)}(y) = 0$ ,*
- ii)  *$D_{(n,0)}(y^s) = 0$  for all  $n > 0$  and  $1 \leq s \leq p-1$ ,*
- iii) *for all  $n > 1$   $D_{(0,n)}(y) = 0$ ,*
- iv)  *$D_{(0,p^n)}(y^s) = 0$  for all  $n > 1$  and  $1 \leq s \leq p-1$ ,*
- v)

$$D_{(i,j)}(y) = \begin{cases} y & \text{if } (i,j) = (0,0), \\ 1 & \text{if } (i,j) = (0,1), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* The item i) follows from Remark 4.7. The item ii) is a consequence of the equality  $D_{(n,0)}(y^s) = y D_{(n,0)}(y^{s-1})$ . Our iterativity rule forces (by Fact 2.16) that

$$(3) \quad D_{(0,j_2)} D_{(0,j_1)} = \binom{j_1 + j_2}{j_1} D_{(0,j_1+j_2)} + \mathcal{O}(D_{(i,j)})_{\substack{0 < i+j < j_1+j_2 \\ i \neq 0}}.$$

For the proof of item iii) we use the equation above in an induction argument. If  $p = 2$ , then  $D_{(0,2)}(y) = 0$ . For  $p > 2$  we have

$$0 = D_{(0,1)} D_{(0,1)}(y) = 2D_{(0,2)}(y) + \mathcal{O}(D_{(0,j)} D_{(i,0)})_{i \neq 0}(y) = 2D_{(0,2)}(y).$$

Assume that  $n \geq 2$  and  $D_{(0,2)}(y) = \dots = D_{(0,n)}(y) = 0$ . Take  $n+1 = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 p + \dots + \gamma_s p^s$ , where  $\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_s < p$ ,  $\gamma_s \neq 0$ .

$$D_{(0,n+1-p^s)} D_{(0,p^s)}(y) = \gamma_s D_{(0,n+1)}(y) + \mathcal{O}(D_{(0,j)} D_{(i,0)})_{i \neq 0}(y) = \gamma_s D_{(0,n+1)}(y).$$

If  $s = 0$ , then the left-hand side of the last expression is equal to  $D_{(0,n)} D_{(0,1)}(y) = 0$ , if  $s \neq 0$  we proceed similarly due to the equation  $D_{(0,p^s)}(y) = 0$ . The proof of the item iv) uses the equation

$$D_{(0,l)}(y^s) = y D_{(0,l)}(y^{s-1}) + D_{(0,l-1)}(y^{s-1})$$

and it is a simple induction on  $s$ . The item v) follows from Lemma 4.2.i).  $\square$

#### 4.1.2. Finding $x$ .

**Fact 4.9.** *There exists an element  $w \in K$  such that*

- i)  $D_{(1,0)}(w) = 1$  and  $D_{(0,1)}(w) = 0$ ,
- ii) for every  $0 < n < m$  we have  $D_{(p^n,0)}(w) = D_{(0,p^n)}(w) = 0$ .

*Proof.* We define  $D_{(0,1)}^* := D_{(0,1)}|_{C_{(1,0)}}$ , note that  $D_{(0,1)}^{*(p)} = 0$  and  $D_{(0,1)}^* \neq 0$ . We start with an element  $x$  from the statement of Fact 4.3, for which we have  $D_{(0,1)}(x) \in C_{(1,0)}$ . Naturally  $D_{(0,1)}(x) \in \ker D_{(0,1)}^{*(p-1)} = \text{im } D_{(0,1)}^*$ . Hence there exists an element  $z \in C_{(1,0)}$  such that  $D_{(0,1)}(x) = D_{(0,1)}(z)$ . Taking  $w = x - z$  give us the first part. The second part follows as in the proof of Fact 4.6.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.10.** *There exists an element  $x \in K$  satisfying*

- i)  $D_{(1,0)}(x) = 1$ ,  $D_{(0,1)}(x) = \alpha_0 y^{p-1}$ ,
- ii)  $D_{(p^n,0)}(x) = 0$  and  $D_{(0,p^n)}(x) = \alpha_n y^{(p-1)p^n}$  for each  $0 < n \leq N$ ,
- iii)  $D_{(p^n,0)}(x) = D_{(0,p^n)}(x) = 0$  for each  $N < n < m$ .

*Proof.* The proof of item ii) is more complicated, but reasoning is similar to the proof of the point i).

i) We start with  $x \in K$  from Fact 4.3. If  $\alpha_0 = 0$ , we proceed like in the proof of Fact 4.6. Assume  $\alpha_0 \neq 0$ , we need  $x' \in C_{(1,0)}$  such that  $D_{(0,1)}(x + x') = \alpha_0 y^{p-1}$ . We have

$$D_{(1,0)}(\alpha_0 y^{p-1} - D_{(0,1)}(x)) = \alpha_0 D_{(1,0)}(y^{p-1}) = 0,$$

therefore  $\alpha_0 y^{p-1} - D_{(0,1)}(x) \in \ker D_{(1,0)} \subseteq \ker D_{(1,0)}^{(p-1)} = \text{im } D_{(1,0)}$ . So there exists  $z \in K$  such that

$$\alpha_0 y^{p-1} - D_{(0,1)}(x) = D_{(1,0)}(z) = -\frac{1}{\alpha_0} D_{(0,1)}^{(p)}(z).$$

The last equality comes from Lemma 4.2, since  $D_{(0,1)}^{(p)} = -\alpha_0 D_{(1,0)}$ . Then we can take  $x' = -\frac{1}{\alpha_0} D_{(0,1)}^{(p-1)}(z)$ , since:

$$D_{(1,0)}\left(x - \frac{1}{\alpha_0} D_{(0,1)}^{(p-1)}(z)\right) = 1 - \frac{1}{\alpha_0} D_{(0,1)}^{(p-1)}(D_{(1,0)}(z)),$$

but

$$\begin{aligned} D_{(0,1)}^{(p-1)}(D_{(1,0)}(z)) &= D_{(0,1)}^{(p-1)}(\alpha_0 y^{p-1} - D_{(0,1)}(x)) \\ &= \alpha_0 D_{(0,1)}^{(p-1)}(y^{p-1}) - D_{(0,1)}^{(p)}(x) \\ &= \alpha_0 (p-1)! + \alpha_0 D_{(1,0)}(x) = \alpha_0 ((p-1)! + 1) \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$



and by Wilson's theorem it is equal to 0.

ii) As in the proof of 4.6, we take the maximal  $0 < l \leq N$  such that for every  $0 < l' < l$

$$D_{(p^{l'},0)}(x) = 0, \quad D_{(0,p^{l'})}(x) = \alpha_{l'} y^{(p-1)p^{l'}}.$$

Case 1.,  $D_{(p^l,0)}(x) \neq 0$ .

Clearly,  $D_{(p^l,0)}(x) \in C_{(p^{l'},0)}$  for every  $0 \leq l' < l$ . Moreover for every  $0 \leq l' < l$

$$\begin{aligned} D_{(0,p^{l'})} D_{(p^l,0)}(x) &= D_{(p^l,0)} D_{(0,p^{l'})}(x) \\ &= D_{(p^l,0)}(\alpha_{l'} y^{(p-1)p^{l'}}) \\ &= \alpha_{l'} D_{(p^l,0)}(y^{(p-1)p^{l'}}) = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

by Proposition 4.8.ii) where the last equation follows. This means that  $D_{(p^l,0)}(x) \in F_{l-1}$  and furthermore  $D_{(p^l,0)}(x) \in \ker D_{(p^l,0)}|_{F_{l-1}}^{(p-1)} = \text{im } D_{(p^l,0)}|_{F_{l-1}}$ . Hence there exists  $z \in F_{l-1}$  such that  $D_{(p^l,0)}(x) = D_{(p^l,0)}(z)$  and we replace  $x$  with  $x - z$ .

Case 2.,  $D_{(p^l,0)}(x) = 0$  and  $D_{(0,p^l)}(x) \neq \alpha_l y^{(p-1)p^l}$ .

If  $\alpha_l = 0$  we argue similarly as many times before (compare also with the proof of item iii)), so let  $\alpha_l \neq 0$ . The aim of this part is to find an element  $x' \in F_{l-1} \cap C_{(p^l,0)}$  such that

$$D_{(0,p^l)}(x + x') = \alpha_l y^{(p-1)p^l}.$$

We introduce

$$W := C_{(0,1)} \cap C_{(p^l,0)} \cap \bigcap_{1 \leq l' < l} C_{(p^{l'},0)} \cap C_{(0,p^{l'})}.$$

Note that the element  $w$  from Fact 4.9 satisfies  $w \in W \setminus \ker D_{(1,0)}^*$ , where  $D_{(1,0)}^* := D_{(1,0)}|_W$ .

**Claim.**  $\ker D_{(1,0)}^* \subseteq \text{im } D_{(1,0)}^*$ .

*Proof of the claim.* Note that  $W_0 := W \cap C_{(1,0)} = F_{l-1} \cap C_{(p^l,0)} = \ker D_{(1,0)}^*$  is a subfield of  $K$  (by Lemma 4.5). Using Lemma 4.4 we obtain that  $W$  is a vector space over  $W_0$ . Now take  $a \in W$  such that  $D_{(1,0)}^*(a) = 0$ , that means  $a \in W_0$ . The element  $a \cdot w$  belongs to  $W$  and moreover  $D_{(1,0)}^*(aw) = a D_{(1,0)}^*(w) = a$ , so  $a \in \text{im } D_{(1,0)}^*$ .  $\square$

It is not hard to see that

$$\alpha_l y^{(p-1)p^l} - D_{(0,p^l)}(x) \in F_{l-1}.$$

Moreover, since  $D_{(1,0)}(y) = 0$ , we have

$$D_{(p^l,0)}(\alpha_l y^{(p-1)p^l}) = \alpha_l D_{(1,0)}(y^{(p-1)p^l}) = \alpha_l (p-1)(y^{p-2} D_{(1,0)}(y))^{p^l} = 0.$$

We conclude that

$$\alpha_l y^{(p-1)p^l} - D_{(0,p^l)}(x) \in F_{l-1} \cap C_{(p^l,0)} = W \cap C_{(1,0)}.$$

In other words  $\alpha_l y^{(p-1)p^l} - D_{(0,p^l)}(x) \in \ker D_{(1,0)}^* \subseteq \text{im } D_{(1,0)}^*$ , and there is  $z \in W$  such that

$$\alpha_l y^{(p-1)p^l} - D_{(0,p^l)}(x) = D_{(1,0)}(z).$$

From Lemma 4.2 we know that

$$D_{(0,p^l)}^{(p)} = -\alpha_l D_{(1,0)} + \sum_{n=p}^{p^l} \beta_n D_{(n,0)},$$

for some  $\beta_n \in k$ . By Remark 4.7 for every  $p \leq i \leq p^l$   $D_{(i,0)}|_W = 0$ , consequently  $D_{(1,0)}(z) = -\frac{1}{\alpha_l} D_{(0,p^l)}^{(p)}(z)$ . For  $x'$  take  $-\frac{1}{\alpha_l} D_{(0,p^l)}^{(p-1)}(z)$ , only an argument for  $D_{(0,p^l)}^{(p-1)}(z) \in C_{(1,0)}$  is missing, and it is straightforward modification of the equation (4).

iii) It follows the proof of Fact 4.6, we need to check only that  $D_{(p^l,0)}(x), D_{(0,p^l)}(x) \in F_{l-1}$  for  $l > N$ . Obviously,  $D_{(p^l,0)}(x), D_{(0,p^l)}(x) \in \bigcap_{l'=0}^{l-1} C_{(p^{l'},0)} \cap \bigcap_{l'=N+1}^{l-1} C_{(0,p^{l'})}$ . Let  $0 \leq l' \leq N$ , then

$$D_{(p^l,0)} D_{(0,p^{l'})}(x) = D_{(p^l,0)}(\alpha_{l'} y^{(p-1)p^{l'}}) = \alpha_{l'} D_{(p^{l-l'},0)}(y^{p-1})^{p^{l'}} = 0,$$

as in (5). Furthermore,

$$D_{(0,p^l)} D_{(0,p^{l'})}(x) = D_{(0,p^l)}(\alpha_{l'} y^{(p-1)p^{l'}}) = \alpha_{l'} D_{(0,p^{l-l'})}(y^{p-1})^{p^{l'}},$$

so we are done if  $D_{(0,p^{l-l'})}(y^{p-1}) = 0$ , which is a part of Proposition 4.8.  $\square$

We fix  $x \in K$  as in the above fact.

**Lemma 4.11.** *We have the following*

- i) for all  $n > 1$   $D_{(n,0)}(x) = 0$ ,
- ii) for all  $n > 0$

$$D_{(0,n)}(x) = \begin{cases} \alpha_l \lambda_i y^{(p-i)p^l} & \text{if } 0 \leq l \leq N, \quad 1 \leq i < p, \quad n = ip^l, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* The item i) for  $n \geq p$  follows from Remark 4.7, and for  $1 < n < p$  from Lemma 4.2 and  $D_{(1,0)}(x) = 1$ . To prove the item ii) we argue inductively. Note that  $\lambda_1 = 1$ , so for  $n = 1$  it is clear. Assume that for every  $n' < n$  our thesis is true. Let  $n = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 p + \dots + \gamma_s p^s$ , where  $\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_s < p$  and  $\gamma_s \neq 0$ .

**Claim 1.**

$$(6) \quad D_{(0,n-p^s)} D_{(0,p^s)}(x) = \gamma_s D_{(0,n)}(x),$$

$$(7) \quad D_{(0,n-\gamma_s p^s)} D_{(0,\gamma_s p^s)}(x) = D_{(0,n)}(x).$$

*Proof of the claim 1.* Both equations have similar proofs, so we consider only the first one. We start with the equation (3) for  $j_1 = p^s$  and  $j_s = n - p^s$ :

$$D_{(0,n-p^s)} D_{(0,p^s)} = \gamma_s D_{(0,n)} + \mathcal{O}(D_{(i,j)})_{\substack{0 < i+j < n \\ i \neq 0}}.$$

Our aim is to show that  $D_{(i,j)}(x) = 0$  for  $0 < i+j < n$ ,  $i \neq 0$ . The component with  $D_{(1,0)}$  ( $i = 1$  and  $j = 0$ ) does not occur. To see this, we compare the sides of the equation from the iterativity definition for our chosen iterativity rule, where on the left-hand side we focus on  $D_{(0,n-p^s)} D_{(0,p^s)}$ . A non-zero component with  $D_{(1,0)}$  implies that  $n = p^{s+1}$  and this is impossible. Let us assume that  $i = 1$  and  $j > 0$ . Because of  $j < n$ ,  $D_{(0,j)}(x)$  is, due to the inductive assumption, equal to  $\beta y^r$  for

some  $\beta \in k$  and  $r > 0$ , and then  $D_{(1,0)}D_{(0,j)}(x) = D_{(1,0)}(\beta y^r) = 0$ . If  $i > 1$ , then  $D_{(i,j)}(x) = D_{(0,j)}D_{(i,0)}(x) = 0$ .  $\square$

**Claim 2.** For every  $0 \leq l \leq N$  and  $0 < i < p$  we have  $D_{(0,ip^l)}(x) = \alpha_l \lambda_i y^{(p-i)p^l}$ .

*Proof of the claim 2.* It is quite an obvious induction, using claim 1.:

$$\begin{aligned} D_{(0,(1+i)p^l)}(x) &= \frac{1}{i+1} D_{(0,p^l)} D_{(0,ip^l)}(x) = \frac{1}{i+1} D_{(0,p^l)}(\alpha_l \lambda_i y^{(p-i)p^l}) \\ &= \frac{\alpha_l \lambda_i}{i+1} D_{(0,1)}(y^{p-i})^{p^l} = \frac{\alpha_l \lambda_i}{i+1} (p-i) y^{(p-i-1)p^l} \\ &= \alpha_l \lambda_{i+1} y^{(p-i-1)p^l}. \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

Now we are going to the proof of the main induction step. We will deal with several cases. If  $s > N$ , then  $D_{(0,p^s)}(x) = 0$  and the equation (6) implies that  $D_{(0,n)}(x) = 0$ . We can assume that  $s \leq N$  and  $n - \gamma_s p^s \neq 0$  (otherwise we apply claim 2),

$$D_{(0,n)}(x) = D_{(0,n-\gamma_s p^s)} D_{(0,\gamma_s p^s)}(x) = \alpha_s \lambda_{\gamma_s} D_{(0,n-\gamma_s p^s)}((y^{p-\gamma_s})^{p^s}).$$

Recall that for every  $a \in K$  the element  $a^{p^s}$  belongs to  $F_{s-1}$ , thus by Lemma 4.4  $D_{(0,n-\gamma_s p^s)}(a^{p^s}) = 0$ .  $\square$

We show below that fixed element  $x$  satisfies the required properties.

**Proposition 4.12.**

$$D_{(i,j)}(x) = \begin{cases} x & \text{if } (i,j) = (0,0), \\ 1 & \text{if } (i,j) = (1,0), \\ \alpha_l \lambda_i y^{(p-i)p^l} & \text{if } (i,j) = (0,ip^l), 0 \leq l \leq N, 1 \leq i < p, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* By Lemma 4.2.i) we decompose  $D_{(i,j)}$  into  $D_{(0,j)}D_{(i,0)}$ . For  $i \geq p$  Remark 4.7 and  $D_{(p^n,0)}(x) = 0$ , where  $0 < n < m$ , ensure us that  $D_{(i,0)}(x) = 0$ , thus also  $D_{(i,j)}(x) = 0$ . For  $1 < i < p$  Remark 4.7.ii) used in an inductive argument give  $D_{(i,0)}(x) = 0$ . If  $i = 1$ , then  $D_{(i,j)}(x) = D_{(j,0)}(1)$ . Hence  $D_{(i,j)}(x) \neq 0$  if and only if  $j = 0$ . The case with  $i = 0$  is exactly Lemma 4.11.  $\square$

By propositions 4.8 and 4.12 the pair  $\{x, y\}$  is a canonical  $G$ -basis (see the beginning of Section 4.1). Thus we end with the following:

**Corollary 4.13.** For  $G$  as defined above, any  $m \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$  and any  $G[m]$ -field  $(K, D[m])$  such that  $[K : C_K] = p^2$ , there is a canonical  $G$ -basis in  $K$ .

**4.2. Canonical  $G$ -bases for commutative and connected groups.** In the previous subsection we showed the existence of a canonical  $G$ -basis for every  $G[m]$ -field  $(K, \mathbb{D})$  such that  $[K : C_K] = p^e$ , where  $G$  was very specific. Now we are going to apply those results to a more general class of algebraic groups.

**Definition 4.14.** Let  $G$  be an algebraic group over  $k$

- (1) We call  $G$  *integrable* if for any  $m \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ , every  $G[m]$ -derivation on a field  $K$  such that  $[K : C_K] = p^{\dim G}$  is strongly integrable.

- (2) If for any  $m \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ , every  $G[m]$ -field  $K$  such that  $[K : C_K] = p^{\dim G}$  has a canonical  $G$ -basis, we call  $G$  *canonically integrable*.

By Theorem 3.8 each canonically integrable algebraic group is integrable.

**Lemma 4.15.** *Let  $G$  and  $H$  be algebraic groups over  $k$ . If both are canonically integrable, then also  $G \times H$  is canonically integrable.*

*Proof.* Introduce  $A := G \times H$ ,  $e_1 := \dim G$ ,  $e_2 := \dim H$  and let  $(K, \mathbb{D})$  be an  $A[m]$ -field such that  $[K : C_K] = p^{e_1+e_2}$ . We define

$$\mathbb{D}' := (D'_{(j_1, \dots, j_{e_1})}) := D_{(j_1, \dots, j_{e_1}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{e_2 \text{ times}})}_{j_1, \dots, j_{e_1} < p^m},$$

$$\mathbb{D}'' := (D''_{(j_{e_1+1}, \dots, j_{e_1+e_2})}) := D_{(\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{e_1 \text{ times}}, j_{e_1+1}, \dots, j_{e_1+e_2})}_{j_{e_1+1}, \dots, j_{e_1+e_2} < p^m}.$$

From the  $A[m]$ -iterativity diagram (see Definition 2.8) it follows that

$$D_{(j_1, \dots, j_{e_1+e_2})} = D'_{(j_1, \dots, j_{e_1})} D''_{(j_{e_1+1}, \dots, j_{e_1+e_2})},$$

$\mathbb{D}'$  is  $G[m]$ -iterative and the second one,  $\mathbb{D}''$  is  $H[m]$ -iterative.

Taking any  $p$ -basis of  $K$  over  $C_K$  and using Remark 3.4 assures us that for every  $s < m$   $[F_{s-1} : F_s] = p^{e_1+e_2}$ . Thus  $[K : C_K^{\text{ab}}] = p^{m(e_1+e_2)}$ . For  $s < m$  we introduce

$$F'_s := \bigcap_{j=0}^s C_{(p^j, 0, \dots, 0)} \cap \dots \cap C_{(0, \dots, 0, p^j, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{e_2 \text{ times}})}, \quad F'_{-1} := K,$$

$$F''_s := \bigcap_{j=0}^s C_{(0, \dots, 0, p^j, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{e_1 \text{ times}})} \cap \dots \cap C_{(0, \dots, 0, p^j)}, \quad F''_{-1} := K.$$

Consider the following tower of subfields

$$K \supseteq F'_0 \supseteq F'_1 \supseteq \dots \supseteq F'_{m-1} \supseteq F'_{m-1} \cap F''_0 \supseteq F'_{m-1} \cap F''_1 \supseteq \dots \supseteq F'_{m-1} \cap F''_{m-1}.$$

For every  $s < m$ , due to Lemma 2.22 and  $[K : C_K^{\text{ab}}] = p^{m(e_1+e_2)}$ , we have

$$[F'_{s-1} : F'_s] = p^{e_1}, \quad [F'_{m-1} \cap F''_{s-1} : F'_{m-1} \cap F''_s] = p^{e_2}.$$

In particular

$$[F'_{m-1} : F'_{m-1} \cap F''_0] = p^{e_2},$$

so there exists a canonical  $H[m]$ -basis  $\{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{e_2}\}$  of  $(F'_{m-1}, \mathbb{D}'')$ . Analogically, there exists a canonical  $G[m]$ -basis  $\{b_1, \dots, b_{e_1}\}$  of  $(F''_{m-1}, \mathbb{D}')$ . Elements  $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{e_2}$  are  $p$ -independent in  $F'_{m-1}$  over  $F'_{m-1} \cap F''_0$ . By Corollary 2.19, they are also  $p$ -independent in  $K$  over  $F'_0$ . Similarly for elements  $b_1, \dots, b_{e_1}$ , Corollary 2.19 implies that they are  $p$ -independent in  $F''_0$  over  $F'_0 \cap F''_0$ . We have

$$[F''_0 : F''_0 \cap F'_0] \leq p^{e_1},$$

hence  $F_0(b_1, \dots, b_{e_1}) = F''_0$  (note that  $C_K = F_0 = F''_0 \cap F'_0$ ). Now we have all the ingredients to state that  $B := \{b_1, \dots, b_{e_1}, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_{e_2}\}$  is a  $p$ -basis of  $K$  over  $C_K$ . Verification that  $B$  is also a canonical  $A$ -basis is not hard and left to the reader.  $\square$

We note the obvious fact:

**Fact 4.16.** *Let  $G$  and  $H$  be isomorphic algebraic groups over  $k$ . If  $G$  is canonically integrable, then also  $H$  is canonically integrable.*

We can prove now the main theorem of this paper.

**Theorem 4.17.** *Let  $G$  be a commutative and connected linear algebraic group over an algebraically closed field  $k$ . If maximal unipotent subgroup of  $G$  has dimension at most 2, then  $G$  is integrable.*

*Proof.* Due to “Jordan decomposition” (last theorem on page 70. in [9]),  $G$  decomposes as  $G_U \times G_S$ , where  $G_U$  consists of unipotent elements and  $G_S$  of semi-simple elements. If the dimension of  $G_U$  is equal to 2 we know by [6, Proposition 8., page 171.] that  $G_U$  is isomorphic to the group defined at the beginning of the previous subsection, so it is canonically integrable. If  $\dim G_U = 1$ , then by [7, Theorem 3.4.9.] it is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{G}_a$ , so canonically integrable by [2, Proposition 4.5.]. We focus now on the semi-simple part. By [7, Lemma 2.4.2.ii)],  $G_S$  is diagonalizable, and by [7, Corollary 3.2.7.ii)] it is a torus. Proposition 4.10 from [2] states that also  $\mathbb{G}_m$  is canonically integrable, so our group  $G$  is isomorphic to the product of canonically integrable groups. Finally, we use Lemma 4.15, Fact 4.16 and Theorem 3.8. □

## REFERENCES

- [1] Daniel Hoffmann and Piotr Kowalski. Existentially closed fields with  $G$ -derivations. Available on <http://arxiv.org/abs/1404.7475>.
- [2] Daniel Hoffmann and Piotr Kowalski. Integrating Hasse-Schmidt derivations. doi: 10.1016/j.jpaa.2014.05.024, 2015.
- [3] Piotr Kowalski. Geometric axioms for existentially closed Hasse fields. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 135:286–302, 2005.
- [4] Hideyuki Matsumura. Integrable derivations. *Nagoya Math. J.*, 87:227–245, 1982.
- [5] Hideyuki Matsumura. *Commutative ring theory*. Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- [6] J.P. Serre. *Algebraic Groups and Class Fields: Translation of the French Edition*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics Series. Springer-Verlag New York Incorporated, 1988.
- [7] Tonny Albert Springer. *Linear Algebraic Groups, 2nd edition*. Birkhäuser, Basel, 1998.
- [8] A. Tyc. On  $F$ -integrable actions of the restricted Lie algebra of a formal group  $F$  in characteristic  $p > 0$ . *Nagoya Math. J.*, 115:125–137, 1989.
- [9] William C. Waterhouse. *Introduction to Affine Group Schemes*. Springer-Verlag, 1979.
- [10] Martin Ziegler. Canonical  $p$ -bases. Available on <http://home.mathematik.uni-freiburg.de/ziegler/preprints/canonical-p-bases.pdf>.
- [11] Martin Ziegler. Separably closed fields with Hasse derivations. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 68:311–318, 2003.

<sup>†</sup>INSTYTUT MATEMATYCZNY, UNIwersYTET WROCLAWSKI, WROCLAW, POLAND  
*E-mail address:* [daniel.hoffmann@math.uni.wroc.pl](mailto:daniel.hoffmann@math.uni.wroc.pl)